Approved For Release 1999/09/07: CIA-RDP75-00001R

Did CIA Take the Senate?

Harper & Brothers have lately published a book entitled A Proposal: Key to an Effective Foreign Policy, which turns out to be one of the collective products of the feverishly active Center for International Studies at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (A mimeographed version, adroitly built up as the latest scientific word on foreign policy, has circulated widely in Washington over the last year.) It calls, in familiar Bowlesian tones, for a permanent foreign aid program to give underdeveloped nations a "sense of progress"—without regard, of course, to U.S. political or strategic interests. In and of itself, therefore, it would not be worth a second thought. But hear us further:

The Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate paid the Center for International Studies \$200,000 for producing *Proposal*, which suggests Mystery Number One, namely: How could all those dollars conceivably have been used up in writing a piece that a skillful hack could have turned out in a couple of months (and, for a thousand dollar advance, would have). Do those MIT digital computers eat green-backs for breakfast?

But Mystery Number Two is even more fascinating. The Center for International Studies, according to persistent rumor, was set up and financed for the most part by the Central Intelligence Agency (through what is called a "cut-out"). Unless this rumor is false, we have the following circle on our hands:

a law (that prohibits CIA's operating within the United States), uses some of the funds to create a domestic research institution, the MIT Center, and that Center regularly publishes slanted books and articles, advocating partisan policies, for the U.S. market. 3) The Center, putting itself forward as a bona fide scientific outfit, asks a Senate committee to give it further funds with which to conduct a study of foreign aid problems. 4) the Senate Committee agrees. 5) The MIT Center obliges with a propaganda brochure.

Gentlemen of the Foreign Relations Committee, it looks to us as if you have been conned. Why not a few pertinent questions to Professors Max Millikan and W. W. Rostow, who authored the brochure, and to their backers?

CPYRGHT